SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			UKHC010037842026 **BA1/385/2026** Sahrana --Applicant **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent **Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.** Mr. Mohd. Safdar, Advocate for the applicant. 2. Mr. Deepak Bisht, D.A.G. for the State. 3. Mr. Sushil Kumar, Advocate for the complainant. 4. The applicant, who is in judicial custody in connection with FIR/Case Crime No. 462 of 2025, under Sections 103(1), 115(2), 333, 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of BNS, registered at P.S.-Pathri, District Haridwar, has sought his release on bail. 5. In this case, during investigation, the injured died and Section 103(1) of BNS was added in the case. 6. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant is not named in the FIR; that no role has been assigned to her in the FIR; that the complainant in their statements recorded under Section 180 of BNSS, have not named the applicant and have not mentioned the fact that applicant was present at the place of incident, but, the two other eye-witnesses Sonam and Mobin, in their statements recorded under Section 180 of BNSS have named the applicant and have also stated that applicant hit the deceased with the brick on her head; that the altercation first took place between the children of

			complainant's sister-in-law Shaheen and children of Gulzar, which resulted into scuffle between the parties due to which the deceased died; that even as per the post-mortem report, the cause of death is brain damage, which was caused by iron rod and the role of hitting the deceased with iron rod is attributed to one Salman; that the iron rod is also recovered from Salman and no recovery of brick has been shown; and, that the applicant is in judicial custody since 16.12.2025. 7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records. 8. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the bail application. 9. Having considered the submissions, under the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the cause of death is brain damage, which was caused by iron rod and the role of hitting the deceased with iron rod is attributed to one Salman and furthermore the iron rod is also recovered from Salman, this Court is of the view that it is a case fit for bail and the applicant deserves to be enlarged on bail. 10. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed. 11. Let the applicant be released on bail on executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties each of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned. **(Alok Mahra J.)** 26.10.2026 Ujjwal